arXiv:math/0211446v1 [math.DG] 28 Nov 2002

EINSTEIN METRICS VIA INTRINSIC OR PARALLEL TORSION

RICHARD CLEYTON AND ANDREW SWANN

Abstract. The classification of Riemannian manifolds by the holonomy group of their Levi-Civita connection picks out many interesting classes of structures, several of which are solutions to the Einstein equations. The classification has two parts. The first consists of isolated examples: the Riemannian symmetric spaces. The second consists of geometries that can occur in continuous families: these include the Calabi-Yau structures and Joyce manifolds of string theory. One may ask how one can weaken the definitions and still obtain similar classifications. We present two closely related suggestions. The classifications for these give isolated examples that are isotropy irreducible spaces, and known families that are the nearly Kähler manifolds in dimension 6 and Gray's weak holonomy G_2 structures in dimension 7.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C10; Secondary 17B10, 53C25, 53C29.

Contents

1. Introduction 3
2. Riemannian Geometry and Metric Connections 5
3. Intrinsic Torsion and Einstein Manifolds 7
4. Berger Algebras and Algebraic Curvature Tensors 9
4.1. Facts and Definitions 9
4.2. Reducible Representations 10
4.3. Berger Decomposition 13
4.4. Irreducible Representations 15
5. Parallel Torsion and Einstein Metrics 17
5.1. Ambrose-Singer Manifolds 17
5.2. Classification 19
6. Invariant Intrinsic Torsion 21
6.1. Invariant versus Parallel Torsion 21
6.2. Classification 23
References 23

1. Introduction

Linear connections and the equivalent notion of G-structures are fundamental areas of interest in differential geometry. Their equivalence goes through the holonomy of the connection and it is a well-known Theorem by Hano and Ozeki that any subgroup G of the general linear group may be realised as the holonomy of a connection on some manifold [11]. On the other hand, one has the much more restrictive class of torsion-free connections and their holonomy. The classification of the irreducible holonomy representations of torsion-free connections was completed by Merkulov and Schwachhöfer [13] and recently Schwachhöfer has given a more algebraic proof [14]. This article concerns itself exclusively with Riemannian manifolds and therefore the particular case of Riemannian holonomy will have special significance. Riemannian holonomies have yielded geometric structures such as Calabi-Yau manifolds, Joyce manifolds, hyperKähler and quaternionic Kähler manifolds of great interest in both mathematics and physics.

If M^n is a Riemannian manifold, the holonomy algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ acts on tangent spaces via a representation V. This induces actions of $\mathfrak{g}$ on the spaces of trace-less symmetric two-tensors S^2_0V and algebraic curvature tensors $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ with values in $\mathfrak{g}$. Apart from the generic holonomy representation of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and that of $\mathfrak{u}(n)$ on $\mathbb{C}^n$ of Kähler geometry, all holonomy representation satisfy that the representations $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ and S^2_0V have no irreducible summands in common. Schur's Lemma shows that this happens precisely when the equation $(\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})\otimes S^2_0V)^G = \{0\}$ is satisfied. As a consequence, a Riemannian manifold is Einstein as soon as the Lie algebra of its holonomy group is a proper subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ not equal to $\mathfrak{u}(n/2)$. Our aim is to generalise this type of statement to the more general framework of metric connections and their holonomy.

Among metric connections, the connections that give rise to the Riemannian holonomy groups may be viewed as precisely those with vanishing intrinsic torsion. The torsion of a metric G-connection is a tensor taking values in $\Lambda^2V^*\otimes V$, where V represents tangent space as a G module. If $\mathfrak{g}^\perp$ denotes the orthogonal complement of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G in $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ with respect of the metric then the projection of the torsion to the image of $V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp$ under the anti-symmetrising map $\delta\colon V^*\otimes \mathfrak{so}(n) \to \Lambda^2V^*\otimes V$ is independent of the chosen G-connection. The tensor thus defined is called the intrinsic torsion of the associated G-structure and encodes its differential geometric data.

Using the decomposition of $V\otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp$ into irreducible G modules one may classify the geometries induced by a G-structure according to where the intrinsic torsion takes its values, an approach first taken by Gray and Hervella [10] for almost Hermitian manifolds and since used by many others.

Interesting examples of connections with non-trivial intrinsic torsion have arisen from Gray's definition of weak holonomy [9]. These include the six-dimensional nearly Kähler geometry with structure group $SU(3)$ and weak holonomy G_2 in dimension 7. Both geometries give Einstein metrics.

In this article we take the following approach. We consider all G-structures on Riemannian manifolds with non-trivial intrinsic torsion. If we consider all metric connections with torsion the Hano-Ozeki Theorem tells us that any Lie subgroup of $O(n)$ can be realised as the holonomy group of a metric connection on some Riemannian manifold. We therefore impose various extra conditions on the G-structure and its intrinsic torsion with the specific aim of obtaining Einstein metrics. The results are classifications akin to Berger's in the sense that we arrive at a discrete family of manifolds made up by the non-symmetric isotropy irreducible homogeneous spaces and continuous families made up of manifolds of weak holonomy G_2 and nearly Kähler six-manifolds.

The contents may be outlined as follows: In section 2, we give some of the basic facts and definitions we will need. In section 3, Theorem 3.3 gives three conditions on the intrinsic torsion and tangent space representation of a G-structure that guarantee a solution to the Einstein equations. The first two of these conditions have as consequences that the intrinsic torsion must be skew-symmetric and that G acts irreducibly on tangent spaces. Given that G acts irreducibly on V, we investigate the consequences of the third condition: $(\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes S^2_0V)^G = \{0\}$ in the fourth section. These are listed in Theorem 4.13. As a by-product of this investigation, we obtain an algorithm for computing the space of algebraic curvature tensors for an arbitrary representation $\mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(n)$. Using the results of section 4, Theorem 5.14 gives a classification of the holonomy groups of metric connection with parallel torsion when the holonomy group acts irreducibly on tangent spaces. Finally, in Theorem 6.6, we make a similar classification of manifolds with a G-structure with invariant skew-symmetric intrinsic torsion and G acting irreducibly on tangent spaces. The crucial fact used here is that under these conditions we may conclude that the intrinsic torsion is parallel.

Gray-Hervella type classifications of spaces with skew-symmetric intrinsic torsion have been made by A. Fino [6], while the case of skew-symmetric torsion have been considered by, among others, Friedrich and Ivanov [7, 8, 12].

Acknowledgements. This paper is based on part of the Ph.D. thesis [5] of the first named author written under the supervision of the second named author. We thank Andrew Dancer, Anna Fino and Stefan Ivanov for useful comments and remarks. The second author wishes to thank F. M. Cabrera and M. D. Monar for their hospitality and useful discussions during the initial stage of this work.

Both authors are members of the EDGE, Research Training Network HPRN-CT-2000-00101, supported by The European Human Potential Programme.

2. Riemannian Geometry and Metric Connections

Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold. The space $O(M)$ of frames on the tangent bundle orthonormal with respect to the metric g forms a principal $O(n)$-bundle, where $O(n)$ acts on the right by change of basis. Write $\mathbb{R}^n$ for the standard representation of $O(n)$. Then the tangent bundle can be identified with the associated vector bundle $O(M)\times_{O(n)}\mathbb{R}^n$ and, similarly, the bundles of (p,q)-tensors on M may be identified with $O(M)\times_{O(n)}(\mathbb{R}^n)^{(p,q)}$. Sections of bundles of tensors may be identified with equivariant maps $\sigma\colon O(M)\to(\mathbb{R}^n)^{(p,q)}$ for which $\sigma(pg)=g^{-1}\sigma(p)$ for $g\in O(n)$ and these sections or maps may be decomposed according to the decomposition of $(\mathbb{R}^n)^{(p,q)}$ into irreducible $O(n)$-submodules. In what follows we will write Λ^p for the p-th exterior power of $\mathbb{R}^n$ as an $O(n)$-representation.

Definition 2.1. Assume that a Riemannian manifold (M, g) has a structure reduction $P\subset O(M)$ to a G-structure. Let V be the induced representation of G on tangent spaces. When M has such a structure reduction we will say that the triple (M, g, V) is a *G-manifold.*

If the representation V is irreducible we say that M or, more precisely, (M, g, V) is *G-irreducible.*

If the structure reduction is given by the holonomy G of a metric connection $\hat{\nabla}$ on (M, g) we will say that (M, g, V) is the G-manifold *determined by* $\hat{\nabla}$.

A *G-connection* $\hat{\nabla}$ on a G-manifold (M, g, V) is a connection for which the holonomy group acts on tangent spaces as a subgroup of G. A *metric connection* on a Riemannian manifold (M, g) is connection with holonomy contained in $O(n)$.

When (M, g, V) is a G-manifold the decompositions of $O(n)$-representations into G-modules let us decompose the tensors of M even further. In this case we have vector bundle isomorphisms $T^{(p,q)}M\cong(M, g)\times_{O(n)}(\mathbb{R}^n)^{(p,q)}\cong P\times_G V^{(p,q)}$ and sections may be thought of as

G-equivariant maps $\sigma\colon P \to V^{(p,q)}$. Let τ be a section of the tensor bundle $T^{(p,q)}M$ and assume that τ via the identification with a G-equivariant map $P \to V^{(p,q)}$ actually takes its values in some submodule $W \subset V^{(p,q)}$. When this is the case we use the convenient notation $\tau \in W$.

Remark 2.2. Note that representations are real unless we state otherwise and all Lie groups and Lie algebras are subgroups and subalgebras of the orthogonal ones. Therefore we are free to identify representations with their duals and will do so.

As an important example, let $\hat\nabla$ be a metric connection on a Riemannian manifold (M, g) and let (M, g, V) be the G-manifold determined by $\hat\nabla$. Since $\hat\nabla$ is a metric connection its holonomy algebra is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g} \leqslant \mathfrak{so}(n)$. The difference between the metric connection and the Levi-Civita connection ∇^g therefore forms a tensor taking values in $V \otimes \mathfrak{so}(n)$:

$$\eta := \nabla^g - \hat\nabla \in V \otimes \mathfrak{so}(n)$$

The map $\delta\colon V \otimes \mathfrak{so}(n) \to \Lambda^2 V \otimes V$ given by $(\delta\alpha)_X Y = \alpha_X Y - \alpha_Y X$ is an isomorphism mapping η to the torsion $\hat T$ of $\hat\nabla$. This justifies using the terms torsion or torsion tensor for either η or $\hat T$ interchangeably.

Let $\hat R$ be the curvature of $\hat\nabla$:

$$\hat R_{X,Y} = [\hat\nabla_X, \hat\nabla_Y] - \hat\nabla_{[X,Y]}.$$

Then the Ambrose-Singer Theorem [1] tells us that $\hat R \in \Lambda^2 V \otimes \mathfrak{g}$.

On M the Levi-Civita connection ∇^g is singled out by requiring that it is a metric connection which is torsion-free:

$$T^g_X Y := \nabla^g_X Y - \nabla^g_Y X - [X, Y] = 0.$$

A consequence of this is that the Riemannian curvature tensor R^g satisfies the first and second Bianchi identities:

$$\begin{gathered} R^g_{X,Y} Z + R^g_{Y,Z} X + R^g_{Z,X} Y = 0 \\ \nabla^g_X R^g_{Y,Z} + \nabla^g_Y R^g_{Z,X} + \nabla^g_Z R^g_{X,Y} = 0. \end{gathered}$$

We write b_1 for the map $\Lambda^2 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(n) \to \Lambda^3 \otimes \Lambda^1$ given by

$$(\mathrm{b}_1 R)(X, Y, Z) = R(X, Y, Z) + R(Y, Z, X) + R(Z, X, Y)$$

and b_2 for the map $\Lambda^1 \otimes \Lambda^2 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(n) \to \Lambda^3 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(n)$ given by

$$(\mathrm{b}_2 R')(X, Y, Z, W) = R'(X, Y, Z, W) + R'(Y, Z, X, W) + R'(Z, X, Y, W).$$

Write $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(n))$ for the kernel of b_1 and $\mathcal{K}'(\mathfrak{so}(n))$ for the kernel of b_2. Then the first and second Bianchi identities say, respectively, that:

$$R^g \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(n)) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^g R^g \in \mathcal{K}'(\mathfrak{so}(n)).$$

Note that when we identify $\Lambda^2 \cong \mathfrak{so}(n)$, we have $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(n)) \subset S^2(\mathfrak{so}(n))$.

If the Riemannian holonomy of g is contained in G then, by the Ambrose-Singer Theorem, R^g takes values in $\Lambda^2 V \otimes \mathfrak{g}$. But R^g also satisfies the first Bianchi identity whence $R \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(n))$. Thus

$$R \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(n)) \cap (\Lambda^2 V \otimes \mathfrak{g}) = \ker\{\mathrm{b}_1 \colon \Lambda^2 V \otimes \mathfrak{g} \to \Lambda^3 V \otimes V\}.$$

Definition 2.3. The representation

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) := \ker\{\mathrm{b}_1 \colon \Lambda^2 V \otimes \mathfrak{g} \to \Lambda^3 V \otimes V\} \tag{2.1}$$

is called the *space of algebraic curvature tensors with values in* $\mathfrak{g}$.

In the presence of a metric connection $\hat{\nabla}$ with torsion $\eta = \nabla^g - \hat{\nabla}$ we may write the Riemannian curvature as

$$R^g = \hat{R} + (\hat{\nabla}\eta) + (\eta^2), \tag{2.2}$$

where $(\hat{\nabla}\eta)$ is the anti-symmetrisation of the covariant derivative of η with respect to $\hat{\nabla}$:

$$(\hat{\nabla}\eta)_{X,Y} Z := (\hat{\nabla}_X \eta)_Y Z - (\hat{\nabla}_Y \eta)_X Z$$

and

$$(\eta^2)_{X,Y} Z := [\eta_X, \eta_Y] Z - \eta_{\eta_X Y - \eta_Y X} Z.$$

Since $R^g \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(n))$ and $\nabla^g R^g \in \mathcal{K}'(\mathfrak{so}(n))$ we have

$$\mathrm{b}_1 \hat{R} = -\mathrm{b}_1(\hat{\nabla}\eta) - \mathrm{b}_1(\eta^2) \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\mathrm{b}_2 \hat{\nabla}\hat{R} = -\mathrm{b}_2 \hat{\nabla}(\hat{\nabla}\eta) - \mathrm{b}_2 \hat{\nabla}(\eta^2). \tag{2.4}$$

We will refer to equations (2.3) and (2.4) as, respectively, the first and second *Bianchi relations.*

3. Intrinsic Torsion and Einstein Manifolds

Let (M, g, V) be the Riemannian G-manifold and let $\hat{\nabla}$ be a G-connection on (M, g). Write $\mathfrak{g}^\perp$ for the orthogonal complement of $\mathfrak{g} < \mathfrak{so}(n)$ and $\eta^{\mathfrak{g}}$ for the component of the torsion tensor η in $V \otimes \mathfrak{g}$. Then the tensor

$$\xi := \eta - \eta^{\mathfrak{g}} \in V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp$$

is independent of the choice of G-connection on (M, g, V). Corresponding to ξ is a connection $\tilde{\nabla} := \nabla^g - \xi$.

Definition 3.1. When (M, g, V) is a G-manifold we call the G-connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ the *minimal connection* and ξ the *intrinsic torsion* of the G-structure.

This definition is justified by the fact that ξ may be identified with the intrinsic torsion of the G-structure as defined in the introduction via the isomorphism δ. The argument above proves

Proposition 3.2. *Let (M, g, V) be a G-manifold. Then the minimal connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ is the unique G-connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ on M such that the torsion tensor*

$$\xi = \nabla^g - \tilde{\nabla} \in V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp .$$

Among the G-connections on (M, g, V) the connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ has the property that it minimises the L^2-norm of torsion tensors (on compact subsets of M). □

The curvature $\tilde{R}$ of the minimal connection is of course related to the Riemannian curvature precisely as in equation (2.2) for general metric connections:

$$R^g = \tilde{R} + (\tilde{\nabla}\xi) + (\xi^2) \tag{3.1}$$

and the first Bianchi relation for $\tilde{R}$ is

$$\mathrm{b}_1 \tilde{R} = -\mathrm{b}_1(\tilde{\nabla}\xi) - \mathrm{b}_1(\xi^2).$$

Write $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ for the kernel of the restriction $\mathrm{b}_1 \colon \Lambda^2 V \otimes \mathfrak{g} \to \Lambda^3 V \otimes V$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})^\perp$ for its orthogonal complement in $\Lambda^2 V \otimes \mathfrak{g}$. Then we may split $\tilde{R}$ into the respective components $\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}_0 + \tilde{R}_1$ and conclude that since b_1 is injective on $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})^\perp$, $\tilde{R}_1$ is completely determined by the intrinsic torsion and its covariant derivative. This observation forms the central idea in

Theorem 3.3. *Let (M, g, V) be a Riemannian G-manifold. Assume that the intrinsic torsion takes values in the G-submodule $W \subset V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp$. Then g is Einstein when the following conditions are satisfied:*

(a) $$(V \otimes W \otimes S^2_0 V)^G = \{0\},$$
(b) $$(S^2 W \otimes S^2_0 V)^G = \{0\},$$
(c) $$(\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes S^2_0 V)^G = \{0\}.$$

Proof. Write the curvature tensor of ∇^g as in formula (3.1). As $\xi \in W$ the tensors $(\tilde{\nabla}\xi)$ and (ξ^2) satisfy

$$(\tilde{\nabla}\xi) \in V \otimes W,$$
$$(\xi^2) \in S^2 W.$$

Since the component $\tilde{R}_1$ of the curvature of the minimal connection is determined by these two tensors we also have $\tilde{R}_1 \in V \otimes W + S^2 W$. Therefore the three conditions together, through Schur's Lemma, imply that no component of the Riemannian curvature can contribute to the trace-free Ricci-tensor, whence g is Einstein. □

The conditions are very strong. Condition (a) implies, first of all, that no irreducible G-module can occur in the decomposition of both V and W, i.e., that $(V \otimes W)^G = \{0\}$. Therefore $(W \otimes (V \otimes S^2 V))^G = \{0\}$. By exactness of the sequence of G-modules

$$0 \longrightarrow \Lambda^3 V \longrightarrow V \otimes \Lambda^2 V \longrightarrow S^2 V \otimes V \longrightarrow S^3 V \longrightarrow 0$$

this implies that $W \subset \Lambda^3 V$.

Condition (b) implies that V is irreducible. We therefore have the following

Corollary 3.4. *Let (M, g, V) be a Riemannian G-manifold for which the intrinsic torsion takes values in $W \subset V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^{\perp}$. If V and W satisfy conditions (a) and (b) of Theorem 3.3 then (M, g, V) is G-irreducible and the intrinsic torsion is a three-form.* □

In particular, Corollary 3.4 ensures that it is not restrictive to assume that V is irreducible when conditions (a) and (b) of Theorem 3.3 are satisfied. Furthermore, when V is an irreducible representation of a Lie group G it is possible to say precisely when condition (c) of Theorem 3.3 is satisfied. This will be the main result of the next section.

4. Berger Algebras and Algebraic Curvature Tensors

The question we wish to address now is: Given that G is a Lie group acting irreducibly on a real vector space V, when does the space of algebraic curvature tensors consist of Einstein tensors only? We will obtain an answer to this at the end of the section. This will be obtained using tools of the Riemannian holonomy classification, most notably the concept of the Berger algebra $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}$ of the Lie algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Note that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G may act reducibly on V even though G acts irreducibly. Therefore we need to be able to calculate Berger algebras and the space of algebraic curvature tensors for reducible as well as irreducible representations.

4.1. **Facts and Definitions.** First a few words on notation: we write $\mathfrak{so}(V)$ for the representation of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ on V whenever V is a real n-dimensional vector space.

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie algebra and V be a faithful representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ as a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(V)$. We then call the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ a *metric representation.* If the representation V of $\mathfrak{g}$ is irreducible we say that $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is irreducible.

The Berger algebra $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}$ of a metric representation $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is the smallest subspace $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$.

We collect some facts about the Berger algebra and the space of algebraic curvature tensors of a metric representation $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$. The first two are elementary consequences of the definitions. For proofs of the latter three we refer the reader to [3, 4, 14].

Fact 1: $(\underline{\mathfrak{g}}, V)$ is a metric representation and $\underline{\underline{\mathfrak{g}}} = \underline{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Fact 2: The space of algebraic curvature tensor for the representation V of $\mathfrak{g}$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = S^2(\mathfrak{g}) \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(V)).$$

Fact 3: The Berger algebra $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}$ of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$.

Fact 4: The Berger algebra satisfies

$$\underline{\mathfrak{g}} = \{r(\alpha) : r \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}), \quad \alpha \in \Lambda^2 V\}.$$

Fact 5: A metric representation $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is a Riemannian holonomy representation if and only if $\mathfrak{g} = \underline{\mathfrak{g}}$.

For ease of reference we also provide a list of the irreducible Riemannian holonomy representations and their associated space of algebraic curvature tensors here, see Table 1. For a complex representation U the notation $[\![U]\!]$ is used to indicate the real representation obtained by restricting scalar multiplication to $\mathbb{R}$. In the table and and hereafter the symbols L, H, E are used for the standard complex representations of $\mathfrak{u}(1)$, $\mathfrak{sp}(1)$, $\mathfrak{sp}(n)$, respectively and $\Lambda^{1,0}$ is used for the standard representations of both $\mathfrak{u}(n)$ and $\mathfrak{su}(n)$. We use the notation V_λ^d for the irreducible representation of dimension d and highest weight λ. Special names have been given to the spin-representation Δ of $\mathfrak{spin}(7)$, the space of Weyl curvature W and the highest weight module $\Sigma_0^{2,2}$ of $S^2(\Lambda^{1,0}) \otimes S^2(\Lambda^{0,1})$.

4.2. **Reducible Representations.** We start by considering the following special instance:

Example 4.2. Let $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$, where V_1 and V_2 are both non-trivial. Consider the inclusion $\mathfrak{so}(V_1) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(V_2) \subset \mathfrak{so}(V)$. We have

$$S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V_1) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(V_2)) = S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V_1)) \oplus \big(\mathfrak{so}(V_1) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(V_2)\big) \oplus S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V_2)).$$

$\mathfrak{g}$	V	$\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$
$\mathfrak{so}(n)$	$\Lambda^1 = \mathbb{R}^n$	$W + S^2_0 + \mathbb{R}$
$\mathfrak{u}(n)$	$\llbracket \Lambda^{1,0} \rrbracket = \mathbb{C}^n$	$\Sigma^{2,2}_0 + \Sigma^{1,1}_0 + \mathbb{R}$
$\mathfrak{su}(n)$	$\llbracket \Lambda^{1,0} \rrbracket = \mathbb{C}^n$	$\Sigma^{2,2}_0$
$\mathfrak{sp}(n) \oplus \mathfrak{sp}(1)$	$EH = \mathbb{H}^n$	$S^4E + \mathbb{R}$
$\mathfrak{sp}(n)$	$\llbracket E \rrbracket = \mathbb{H}^n$	S^4E
$\mathfrak{spin}(7)$	$\Delta = \mathbb{R}^8$	$V^{168}_{(0,2,0)}$
$\mathfrak{g}_2$	$V^7 = \mathbb{R}^7$	$V^{77}_{(0,2)}$
$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{p}$	$\mathbb{R}$

TABLE 1. The irreducible Riemannian holonomy representations and the associated spaces of algebraic curvature tensors. In the last row $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{p}$ denotes the isotropy algebra and representation, respectively, of those irreducible symmetric spaces not covered by earlier entries in the table.

The image of $S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V)))$ under b_1 is $\Lambda^4 V$ which decomposes as

$$\Lambda^4 V = \Lambda^4 V_1 \oplus \bigl(\Lambda^3 V_1 \otimes V_2\bigr) \oplus \bigl(\Lambda^2 V_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 V_2\bigr) \oplus \bigl(V_1 \otimes \Lambda^3 V_2\bigr) \oplus \Lambda^4 V_2.$$

Let $e_1, \dots, e_p$ be an orthonormal basis of V_1 and $f_1, \dots, f_q$ an orthonormal basis of V_2. Then the set consisting of

$$(e_i \wedge e_j) \vee (f_k \wedge f_l),$$

where $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant p$ and $1 \leqslant k < l \leqslant q$, gives a basis of the subspace $\mathfrak{so}(V_1) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(V_2) \subset S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V))$. The images of these tensors under b_1 span the subspace $\Lambda^2 V_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 V_2$ of $\Lambda^4 V$. Therefore $\mathrm{b}_1 \colon \mathfrak{so}(V_1) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(V_2)) \to \Lambda^2 V_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 V_2$ is an isomorphism. Moreover, $\mathrm{b}_1(S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V_1))) = \Lambda^4 V_1$ and $\mathrm{b}_1(S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V_2))) = \Lambda^4 V_2$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(V_1) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(V_2)) &= S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V_1) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(V_2)) \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(V)) \\ &= \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(V_1)) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(V_2)). \end{aligned}$$

More generally, we wish to consider the situation where $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is a metric representation and V_1 and V_2 are orthogonal submodules of V such that

$$V = V_1 \oplus V_2.$$

Let $\pi \colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(V)$ be the representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ on V and let $\pi_i \colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(V_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ be the two sub-representations. Then $\pi = \pi_1 + \pi_2$ and, since π is faithful, the kernels $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 = \ker \pi_2$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2 = \ker \pi_1$ intersect trivially, so $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \oplus \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2 \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$. On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{g}_i := \pi_i(\mathfrak{g})$ then $\mathfrak{g} \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$ via the inclusion π.

We consider two extremal cases. First, when $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 = \mathfrak{g}_1$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2 = \mathfrak{g}_2$. Then $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2 \overset{\pi}{\hookrightarrow} \mathfrak{so}(V_1) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(V_2)$, where $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_i) \subset \mathfrak{so}(V_i)$. The computations of Example 4.2 show that in this case

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \big(S^2(\mathfrak{g}_1) \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(V_1))\big) \oplus \big(S^2(\mathfrak{g}_2) \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{so}(V_2))\big) = \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_1) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_2).$$

In other words, we have

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $(\mathfrak{g}_1, V_1)$ *and* $(\mathfrak{g}_2, V_2)$ *be metric representations. Then* $(\mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2, V_1 \oplus V_2)$ *is a metric representation and*

$$\underline{\mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2} = \underline{\mathfrak{g}_1} \oplus \underline{\mathfrak{g}_2}, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2) = \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_1) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_2). \tag{4.2}$$

□

The lemma shows that new metric representations may be obtained by making direct products of Lie algebras and representations and, furthermore, that the Berger algebra and space of algebraic curvature tensors of these new metric representation are obtained from those of the summands by direct product. If a metric representation is obtained in this fashion, we will use the shorthand notation

$$\bigoplus (\mathfrak{g}_i, V_i) := \left(\bigoplus \mathfrak{g}_i, \bigoplus V_i \right). \tag{4.3}$$

The second extremal case is when $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 = \{0\} = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2$.

Lemma 4.4. *If* $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ *is a metric representation and* $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ *is an orthogonal decomposition of* V *into submodules* V_1, V_2 *such that both the induced representations* $\pi_i \colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(V_i)$ *are faithful then*

$$\underline{\mathfrak{g}} = \{0\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{0\}.$$

Proof. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ be a metric representation and $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ is an orthogonal decomposition of V where both the sub-representations $\pi_i \colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(V_i)$ are faithful. Then $\mathfrak{g}$ is included diagonally into a direct sum $\mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$ of two copies $\mathfrak{g}_i$, $i = 1, 2$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ with $\mathfrak{g}_i \subset \mathfrak{so}(V_i)$. Therefore $S^2(\mathfrak{g}) \subset S^2(\mathfrak{g}_1) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_2 \oplus S^2(\mathfrak{g}_2)$, where $S^2(\mathfrak{g}_i) \subset S^2(\mathfrak{so}(V_i))$ and $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1 \subset \mathfrak{so}(V_1) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(V_2)$. As $\mathrm{b}_1(\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_2) \cong \mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_2$ is orthogonal to $\mathrm{b}_1(S^2(\mathfrak{g}_1) \oplus S^2(\mathfrak{g}_2))$ any element R of $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ must project to zero in $\mathfrak{so}(V_1) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(V_2)$. Assume that $\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^d$ is an orthogonal basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. Write $\gamma^k = \gamma^k_1 + \gamma^k_2$, where $\gamma^k_i = \pi_i(\gamma^k)$. Any element $R \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ may then be written as

$$R = \sum_{k \leqslant l} a_{kl} \gamma^k \vee \gamma^l.$$

The projection of R to $\mathfrak{so}(V_1) \otimes \mathfrak{so}(V_2)$ is

$$\sum_{k \leqslant l} a_{kl}(\gamma_2^k \vee \gamma_1^l + \gamma_1^k \vee \gamma_2^l) = \sum_{k,l} a_{kl} \gamma_1^k \vee \gamma_2^l$$

which is zero only if $R = 0$. The Lemma follows. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *Let* $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ *be a metric representation. Assume that* $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ *is a decomposition of* V *into orthogonal submodules and let* $\pi_i : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(V_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ *be the induced representations. Define* $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 := \ker \pi_2$ *and* $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2 := \ker \pi_1$. *Then* $(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1, V_1)$ *and* $(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2, V_2)$ *are metric representations such that*

$$\underline{\mathfrak{g}} = \underline{\hat{\mathfrak{g}}}_1 \oplus \underline{\hat{\mathfrak{g}}}_2 \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2). \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. When $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is metric representation with an orthogonal decomposition of V into submodules $V_1 \oplus V_2$ we define $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_i$, and $\mathfrak{g}_i$ as before. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{g}$ be the orthogonal complement of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \oplus \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2$ in $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}_i \cong \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_i \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_i$, where $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_i = \pi_i(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and thus

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \oplus \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2 \subset \mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2 \cong (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_1) \oplus (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2 \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_2) \subset \mathfrak{so}(V_1) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(V_2).$$

By Lemma 4.3,

$$\mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \oplus \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2) = \mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2) = \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_1) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_2),$$

whence

$$\mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2) \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_1) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_2) \subset S^2(\mathfrak{g}_1) \oplus S^2(\mathfrak{g}_2).$$

The final inclusion shows that any algebraic curvature tensor $R \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ must have trivial projection to $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \otimes \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_2 \subset S^2(\mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2)$. By an argument similar to the one given in the proof of Lemma 4.4, any curvature tensor in $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ must satisfy that the component taking values in $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ vanishes and therefore $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1) \oplus \mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2)$. $\square$

4.3. **Berger Decomposition.** Metric representations are not generally of the form given by equation (4.3). An obvious question to ask is therefore: how may one compute the Berger algebra and the space of algebraic curvature tensors for an arbitrary metric representation $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$? The results of the previous section will allow us to introduce a Berger decomposition of the metric representation and show that the Berger algebra of the metric representation may be computed as a direct sum of Berger algebras of the irreducible summands of the Berger decomposition. The irreducible case is then dealt with in the next section.

Definition 4.6. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ be a reducible metric representation and let

$$(*) \qquad V = \bigoplus_i V_i$$

be an orthogonal decomposition of V into irreducible submodules. For each i let

$$\hat{V}_i := \bigoplus_{j \neq i} V_j,$$

let π_i and $\hat{\pi}_i$ be the projections $\pi_i \colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(V_i)$ and $\hat{\pi}_i \colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(\hat{V}_i)$, and let $\mathfrak{g}_i = \ker \hat{\pi}_i$. Then *the Berger decomposition* of $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ with respect to the decomposition $(*)$ is

$$B(\mathfrak{g}, V) = \bigoplus_i (\mathfrak{g}_i, V_i).$$

The definition and the results of the previous section proves

Proposition 4.7. *Let* $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ *be a metric representation. Assume that*

$$B(\mathfrak{g}, V) = \bigoplus_i (\mathfrak{g}_i, V_i).$$

is a Berger decomposition of $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$. *Then*

$$\underline{\mathfrak{g}} = \bigoplus_i \underline{\mathfrak{g}}_i \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}_i).$$

□

Example 4.8. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a simple Lie algebra and let V be a non-trivial, real representation of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is a metric representation. If $V_i \subset V$ is a non-trivial submodule of V then $\mathfrak{g}_i$ is non-trivial only if $\hat{V}_i \cong k\mathbb{R}$, where k is a non-negative integer. Therefore $\underline{\mathfrak{g}} \neq \{0\}$ only if V is either irreducible or isomorphic to $V' \oplus k\mathbb{R}$ for some irreducible representation V'.

Note that the component representations of a Berger decomposition may themselves be reducible. So to calculate the Berger algebra of an arbitrary metric representation we might need to invoke Proposition 4.7 several times. However, we also have the following corollary of Lemma 4.4:

Lemma 4.9. *Let* $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ *be a metric representation. If* $V \cong kV'$ *for* $k > 1$ *and some representation* V' *of* $\mathfrak{g}$ *then* $\underline{\mathfrak{g}} = \{0\}$.

Proof. If $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is a metric representation where $V = kV'$ then any orthogonal decomposition $V = V' \oplus (k-1)V'$ satisfies that the induced representations $\pi' \colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}(V')$ and $\pi'' \colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{so}((k-1)V')$ are faithful. Therefore Lemma 4.4 applies. □

Using Lemma 4.9 we may eliminate any reducible component representations from a Berger decomposition. To see this, consider the case of $\mathfrak{g}$ represented on $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ where V_1 is an irreducible representation and V_2 is its orthogonal complement. Write $\mathfrak{g} = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \oplus \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_2 \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ as above. Then $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \cong \pi_1(\mathfrak{g})$ acts irreducibly on V_1. Thus, $\mathfrak{g}_1$ must act on V_1 as a direct sum of isomorphic representations if it does not act irreducibly.

The results we have found in the present section, form an algorithm for finding the Berger algebra of an arbitrary metric representation $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$: first decompose V into irreducible submodules $V = \bigoplus V_i$ and construct its Berger decomposition $B(\mathfrak{g}, V) = \bigoplus(\mathfrak{g}_i, V_i)$. Then the Berger algebra may be computed using Proposition 4.7, Lemma 4.9 and Proposition 4.10.

4.4. **Irreducible Representations.** The promised result for determining when condition (c) of Theorem 3.3 is satisfied, is nearly at hand. In fact, from the results of the previous section we may conclude

Proposition 4.10. *Let* $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ *be an irreducible metric representation. Then* $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ *satisfies either*

(i) $\underline{\mathfrak{g}} = \{0\}$,
(ii) $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}$ *is a Riemannian holonomy representation,*
(iii) *or* $\underline{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{sp}(n)$ *and* $(\mathfrak{g}, V) = (\mathfrak{sp}(n) + \mathfrak{u}(1), \llbracket EL \rrbracket)$, *where* E *and* L *are the standard complex representations of* $\mathfrak{sp}(n)$ *and* $\mathfrak{u}(1)$.

Proof. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ be an irreducible metric representation. Assume that $\underline{\mathfrak{g}} \neq \{0\}$. Write $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$, where $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \underline{\mathfrak{g}}$. Then the complexification $V \otimes \mathbb{C}$ falls into one of the following cases, depending on the types of representation of $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathfrak{g}_1$ and $\mathfrak{g}_2$ on V. In this respect we follow the conventions of Bröcker and tom Dieck [2].

1. If V is of real type, then either
   (a) $V \otimes \mathbb{C} = U_1 \otimes U_2$, where U_1 and U_2 are irreducible complex representations of real type, or,
   (b) $V \otimes \mathbb{C} = U_1 \otimes U_2$, where U_1 and U_2 are irreducible complex representations of quaternionic type.
2. If V is of complex type, then $V \otimes \mathbb{C} = U_1 \otimes U_2 + \overline{U_1 \otimes U_2}$ where U_1 and U_2 are irreducible complex representations and either U_1 or U_2 is of complex type.

(3) If V is of quaternionic type then $V\otimes\mathbb{C} = 2U_1\otimes U_2$ where U_1 and U_2 are irreducible complex representations and either
   (a) U_1 is of quaternionic type and U_2 is of real type, or,
   (b) U_1 is of real type and U_2 is of quaternionic type.

Lemma 4.9 ensures that the restriction of the representation V to $\mathfrak{g}_1$ is irreducible. This places severe restrictions on the dimension of U_2. To obtain the desired result all that is needed is essentially book-keeping: In case (1a), the dimension of U_2 must be one, so $\mathfrak{g}_2 \leqslant \mathfrak{so}(1) = \{0\}$. In case (1b) if $q = \dim U_1$ then $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{sp}(q/2)$ as this is the only holonomy representation of quaternionic type, and $\dim U_2 = 2$ whence $\mathfrak{g}_2 = \{0\}$ or $\mathfrak{sp}(1)$. However, the later possibility contradicts the holonomy classification, so $\mathfrak{g}_2 = \{0\}$.

In case (2), $\dim U_2$ must be one for V to be irreducible and $\mathfrak{g}_2$ must then be either $\{0\}$ or $\mathfrak{u}(1)$. Then $\mathfrak{g}_1$ and U_1 must be either $\mathfrak{u}(n)$, $\mathfrak{su}(n)$ or $\mathfrak{sp}(n)$ acting on their standard complex representations. However, $\mathfrak{u}(n) \oplus \mathfrak{u}(1)$ does not act faithfully on $\Lambda^{1,0}\otimes L$ and $\mathfrak{su}(n) \oplus \mathfrak{u}(1)$ acting on $\Lambda^{1,0}\otimes L$ is a holonomy representation, so the only possibilities are $\mathfrak{g}_2 = \{0\}$ or $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{sp}(n)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_2 = \mathfrak{u}(1)$ with $U_1 = E$, $U_2 = L$.

In case (3a), $\dim U_2$ is one again and $\mathfrak{g}_2 \leqslant \mathfrak{so}(1) = \{0\}$. In case (3b), $\dim U_2 \geqslant 2$ and this implies that V is reducible and thus we have a contradiction with the initial assumption. $\square$

Corollary 4.11. *If V is an irreducible representation of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ then either $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{0\}$ or $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is an irreducible holonomy representation, or $(\mathfrak{sp}(n) \oplus \mathfrak{u}(1), [\![EL]\!])$.* $\square$

The assumption of irreducibility in Corollary 4.11 is not quite what we want. If G is a connected Lie group there is no problem as any irreducible G-representation will be an irreducible module of its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. If G is not connected we may have an irreducible G representation V that is reducible as a representation of $\mathfrak{g}$. But then its decomposition as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module is into a direct sum of isomorphic submodules. This is so since the identity component G_0 of G preserves the $\mathfrak{g}$-irreducible submodules. So if V_1 and V_2 are G_0-irreducible subrepresentations of V then there is some element of $G \setminus G_0$ that maps V_1 to V_2 whereby they are seen to be isomorphic as G_0-representations. Lemma 4.9 then yields:

Corollary 4.12. *Let V be an n-dimensional, irreducible, real representation of a Lie group G. If the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G acts reducibly on V then $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{0\}$.* $\square$

The Corollaries 4.11 and 4.12 and the third column of Table 1 give us:

Theorem 4.13. *Let V be an irreducible representation of a Lie group G. Then one of the following holds*

(a) $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{0\}$,
(b) *G acts on V as an irreducible holonomy representation, or,*
(c) *$G = Sp(n)\,U(1)$ and $V = [\![EL]\!]$.*

In particular, the space of algebraic curvature tensors consists only of Einstein tensors if and only if $\mathfrak{g}$ is a proper subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ and V is not the standard representation of $\mathfrak{u}(n/2)$. □

Note for future use, that in case (c) the Berger algebra is $\mathfrak{sp}(n)$.

5. Parallel Torsion and Einstein Metrics

In this section we return to the following set-up: Let (M, g, V) be a G-manifold determined by $\hat{\nabla}$, a metric connection on M. Let $\eta \in V{\otimes}\Lambda^2 V$ be its torsion tensor. Assume that the torsion tensor is parallel with respect to $\hat{\nabla}$:

$$\hat{\nabla}\eta = 0.$$

Note that this implies that η is invariant by the holonomy G of $\hat{\nabla}$, whence $\eta^{\mathfrak{g}}_X.\eta = 0$ where . denotes the standard action of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ on $V{\otimes}\,\mathfrak{so}(n)$. We conclude that the intrinsic torsion ξ of (M, g, V) is invariant by G as well as parallel with respect to the minimal connection. Therefore the following definitions are equivalent:

Definition 5.1. Let (M, g) be Riemannian manifold. We say that (M, g) *has parallel torsion* if it admits a metric connection $\hat{\nabla}$ for which the torsion η satisfies $\hat{\nabla}\eta = 0$.

Definition 5.2. Let (M, g, V) be a G-manifold. We say that (M, g, V) *is a parallel G-manifold* if the intrinsic torsion is parallel with respect to the minimal connection.

The following result is then an easy consequence of equation (2.2) and invariance of the torsion by the holonomy group.

Theorem 5.3. *Let (M, g, V) be a parallel G-manifold which furthermore is G-irreducible. Then (M, g) is Einstein if $(\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}){\otimes}S^2_0 V)^G = \{0\}$.* □

5.1. **Ambrose-Singer Manifolds.**

A particular instance of parallel G-manifolds are those which admit a connection for which both the curvature and the torsion are parallel.

Definition 5.4. Let D be a metric connection on a Riemannian manifold (M, g) for which the curvature R^D and torsion T^D satisfies

$$DT^D = 0, \qquad DR^D = 0.$$

Then D is called *an Ambrose-Singer connection.* A triple (M, g, D) where (M, g) is a Riemannian manifold and D is an Ambrose-Singer connection will be called *an Ambrose-Singer manifold.*

Remark 5.5. In the literature, an Ambrose-Singer manifold is often called a *locally homogeneous manifold.* Note that Ambrose-Singer manifolds are *not* locally diffeomorphic to homogeneous spaces.

To each Ambrose-Singer connection D we may of course associate the G-manifold (M, g, V) given by its holonomy. Thereby we obtain a parallel G-manifold (M, g, V). An obvious question is: When do we obtain an Ambrose-Singer manifold from a Riemannian manifold with parallel torsion?

Lemma 5.6. *Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold and let $\hat{\nabla}$ be a metric connection on M with parallel torsion. If the Riemannian G-manifold (M, g, V) given by the holonomy of $\hat{\nabla}$ has trivial Berger algebra then $(M, g, \hat{\nabla})$ is an Ambrose-Singer manifold.*

Proof. Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold with a metric connection $\hat{\nabla}$ for which the torsion tensor η is parallel. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of the holonomy of $\hat{\nabla}$. Assume that $\underline{\mathfrak{g}} = \{0\}$ or, equivalently, that $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{0\}$. This implies that the curvature $\hat{R}$ is determined completely by the tensor (η^2) through the Bianchi relation (2.3). Therefore both

$$\hat{\nabla}\eta = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\nabla}\hat{R} = 0$$

hold. $\square$

To an Ambrose-Singer manifold (M, g, D) one may also associate an *infinitesimal model.* Briefly, this consists in building a Lie bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\mathfrak{h}}$ on $\mathfrak{h} := \mathfrak{g} \oplus V$ by defining

$$[A + X, B + Y]_{\mathfrak{h}} := \Big([A, B]_{\mathfrak{g}} + \hat{R}_{X,Y}\Big) + \Big(AY - BX - \hat{T}_X Y\Big). \tag{5.1}$$

where $\hat{T}_X Y = -\eta_X Y + \eta_Y X$ is the 'usual' torsion of $\hat{\nabla}$, $A, B \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $X, Y \in V$. The Bianchi relations and invariance of $\hat{T}$ and $\hat{R}$ by $\mathfrak{g}$ ensures that this satisfies the Jacobi-identity. Thus, we obtain a pair of Lie algebras $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ with $\mathfrak{g} \leqslant \mathfrak{h}$.

Definition 5.7. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ be a pair of Lie algebras. We say that $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is *effective* if $\mathfrak{g} \leqslant \mathfrak{h}$ and the representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ on $\mathfrak{h} / \mathfrak{g}$ is faithful.

Remark 5.8. When $\mathfrak{g}$ is the holonomy algebra of an Ambrose-Singer connection and $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus V$ with Lie bracket defined as in equation (5.1) above then the pair of Lie algebras $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is effective.

Definition 5.9. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ be Lie algebras such that $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is effective. Let H be the connected, simply-connected Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ and G the connected Lie subgroup of H with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. We will say that $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is *regular* if H a closed subgroup of G. Similarly we will say that *an Ambrose-Singer manifold is regular* if the pair of Lie algebras obtained from its infinitesimal model is regular.

In [15], Tricerri proved the following Theorem.

Theorem 5.10. *An Ambrose-Singer manifold is locally isometric to a homogeneous space if and only it is regular.* □

Corollary 5.11. *Let (M, g, V) be a G-manifold where G is the holonomy of a metric connection $\hat{\nabla}$ on M with parallel torsion. Assume that the Berger algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ is trivial. Then $(M, g, \hat{\nabla})$ is an Ambrose-Singer manifold and (M, g) is locally isometric to a homogeneous space if and only if $(M, g, \hat{\nabla})$ is regular.* □

Note that if a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ has a reductive decomposition $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus V$ where V is an irreducible and faithful representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ then $\overline{G}$ must be either H or G. By continuity $\overline{G}$ preserves the reductive decomposition $\mathfrak{g} \oplus V$. So assuming that $\overline{G} = H$ leeds to the conclusion that the action of $\mathrm{ad}_{\mathfrak{h}}$ preserves the subspaces of the reductive splitting. In particular, $[\mathfrak{g}, V] \subset V$ and $[V, \mathfrak{g}] \subset \mathfrak{g}$. This implies that $\mathfrak{g}$ acts trivially on V and therefore establishes a contradiction. So we have

Proposition 5.12. *Let (M, g, V) be a G-irreducible manifold where G is the holonomy of a metric connection for which the torsion is parallel. Assume that the Berger algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ is trivial. Then (M, g) is locally isometric to an isotropy irreducible homogeneous space H/G.* □

5.2. **Classification.** Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold, parallel with respect to some metric connection $\hat{\nabla}$. Assume that the holonomy algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of $\hat{\nabla}$ acts irreducibly on the tangent spaces V. If the torsion is assumed to be non-trivial, this immediately places heavy restrictions on the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ since $\mathfrak{g}$ must leave some tensor in $V \otimes \mathfrak{so}(n)$ invariant. If we write $\mathfrak{so}(n) = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^{\perp}$ then we have one of two possibilities: Either $\mathfrak{g} \cong V$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ is a simple Lie algebra or $\mathfrak{g}^{\perp}$ contains a submodule isomorphic to V. The following lemma is obtained by inspection of representations.

Lemma 5.13. *Let $V \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ be an irreducible representation of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} \leqslant \mathfrak{so}(n)$ and let $\mathfrak{g}^\perp$ be the orthogonal complement of $\mathfrak{g}$ in $\mathfrak{so}(n)$.*

- (i) *Assume that $(V \otimes \mathfrak{g})^G \neq \{0\}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple Lie algebra $V \cong \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) \cong \mathbb{R}$.*
- (ii) *Assume that $\left(V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp\right)^G \neq \{0\} \neq \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$. Then $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is either $(\mathfrak{su}(3), \mathbb{C}^3)$ or $(\mathfrak{g}_2, V^7)$. In both cases $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ is an irreducible representation not isomorphic to V nor to $\mathbb{R}$.*

In all cases the invariant tensors are three-forms. □

Lemma 5.13 allows us to make the following classification Theorem:

Theorem 5.14. *Let (M, g, V) be a G-irreducible manifold determined by a metric connection $\hat{\nabla}$ on (M, g). Assume that the torsion of $\hat{\nabla}$ is parallel with respect to $\hat{\nabla}$. Then one of the following statements holds:*

- (a) *(M, g) is locally isometric to a non-symmetric, isotropy irreducible homogeneous space,*
- (b) *(M, g) is locally isometric to one of the irreducible symmetric spaces $(G \times G)/G$ or $G^{\mathbb{C}}/G$,*
- (c) *(M, g) has weak holonomy $SU(3)$ or G_2,*
- (d) *the torsion of $\hat{\nabla}$ vanishes and (M, g, V) is the G-manifold determined by the Levi-Civita connection and G is the Riemannian holonomy group of (M, g).*

Proof. Assume that (M, g, V) is a G-irreducible Riemannian manifold determined by a metric connection such that the torsion η is non-trivial and parallel: $\hat{\nabla}\eta = 0$.

If the space of algebraic curvature tensors is trivial then proposition 5.12 applies $(M, g, \hat{\nabla})$ is an Ambrose-Singer manifold and locally isometric to an isotropy irreducible space.

If $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) \neq \{0\}$ then $\mathfrak{g}$ acts irreducibly on V by Lemma 4.9. The torsion η is therefore skew-symmetric by Lemma 5.13. Since $\hat{\nabla}\eta = 0$ we may write

$$R^g = \hat{R} + (\eta^2)$$

where

$$(\eta^2)_{X,Y} Z = [\eta_X, \eta_Y] Z - \eta_{\eta_X Y - \eta_Y X} Z.$$

Note that since η is skew-symmetric we have

$$(\eta^2) = \eta^2 + \mathrm{b}_1 \eta^2$$

where $\eta^2_{X,Y} Z := \eta_Z(\eta_X Y)$. Also note that

$$(\mathrm{b}_1 \eta^2)_{X,Y} Z = \eta_X(\eta_Y Z) - \eta_{\eta_X Y} Z - \eta_Y(\eta_X Z) = (\eta_X . \eta)_Y Z$$

where . denotes the standard action of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ on $V \otimes \mathfrak{so}(n)$.

Assume that $\mathrm{b}_1\eta^2 = 0 = \eta.\eta = \mathrm{b}_1\hat{R}$. Then both $\hat{R}$ and η^2 are algebraic curvature tensors. Furthermore, since $0 = \mathrm{b}_1\eta^2 = \eta.\eta$ the torsion tensor takes values in $V \otimes \mathfrak{g}'$ where $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \operatorname{stab}\eta \geqslant \mathfrak{g}$. This means that $(\eta^2) = \eta^2 \in \mathcal{K}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and therefore η^2 spans a trivial submodule $\mathcal{K}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. Now Lemma 5.13 and Table 1 shows that $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ must be a simple Lie algebra and that $V \cong \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, and thus also that $\mathfrak{g} = \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{g}) \cong \mathbb{R}$. So $\hat{R} = \kappa\eta^2$ for some function $\kappa\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$. But (M, g) is Einstein by Theorem 5.3, so the scalar curvature s_g is constant. But

$$s_g = \sum_{i,j} g(R^g_{e_i,e_j}e_j, e_i) = (1+\kappa)\sum_{i,j} g(\eta_{e_i}e_j, \eta_{e_i}e_j) = 2(1+\kappa)\left\|\eta\right\|^2$$

where $\{e_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of V and both s_g and $\left\|\eta\right\|^2$ are constants. Therefore κ must be constant too, whence $\nabla^g R^g = (1+\kappa)(\hat{\nabla}(\eta^2) + \eta.(\eta^2)) = 0$.

Finally, if $\eta.\eta \neq 0$ then the projection ξ of η to $V \otimes \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is non-trivial. Applying Lemma 5.13 shows that $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g}$, $\xi = \eta$ and that $(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is either $(\mathfrak{su}(3), \mathbb{C}^3)$ or $(\mathfrak{g}_2, V^7)$. □

6. Invariant Intrinsic Torsion

Empirical evidence suggests that condition (b) of Theorem 3.3 in fact implies that the intrinsic torsion must be invariant, i.e., $W \cong k\mathbb{R}$. Let this serve as motivation for considering that case in particular detail. Theorem 3.3 with $W \cong k\mathbb{R}$ becomes

Proposition 6.1. *Let (M^n, g, V) be a Riemannian G-manifold. Assume that the intrinsic torsion takes its values in the G-submodule $W \cong k\mathbb{R} \subset V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp$. Then g is Einstein if the following conditions are satisfied:*

(a′) $(V \otimes S^2_0 V)^G = \{0\}$
(b′) *V is irreducible.*
(c′) *$\mathfrak{g}$ is a proper subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ and $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{u}(n/2)$.*

□

As before, these assumptions imply that the intrinsic torsion is a three-form.

6.1. **Invariant versus Parallel Torsion.** The assumption of invariance of the intrinsic torsion appears more general than that of parallel torsion. It is clear that a manifold with parallel intrinsic torsion must have invariant intrinsic torsion, since the G-structure given by the holonomy of the minimal connection in this case leaves the torsion invariant. In this section, we will prove that the converse holds under a quite weak condition.

Theorem 6.2. *Let* (M,g,V) *be a* G*-manifold with skew-symmetric intrinsic torsion taking values in some submodule* W *of* $V\otimes\mathfrak{g}^\perp$*. If* $(V\otimes W\otimes S^2W)^G=\{0\}$ *then the intrinsic torsion is parallel with respect to the minimal connection.*

Proof. Let $\tilde\nabla$ be the minimal connection and ξ the intrinsic torsion of M. Write $\mathfrak{g}^\perp$ for the orthogonal complement of $\mathfrak{g}$ in $\mathfrak{so}(n)$. We write the Riemannian curvature tensor as

$$R^g=\tilde R+(\tilde\nabla\xi)+(\xi^2).$$

where $\tilde R\in\Lambda^2V\otimes\mathfrak{g}$, $(\tilde\nabla\xi)\in\Lambda^2V\otimes\mathfrak{g}^\perp$ and $(\xi^2)\in(S^2(\mathfrak{g}^\perp))^G$. We have that $(\tilde\nabla\xi)$ is the anti-symmetrisation on the first two factors of $\tilde\nabla\xi\in V\otimes\Lambda^3V$. When restricted to $V\otimes\Lambda^3V$, this anti-symmetrisation is an isomorphism $V\otimes\Lambda^3V\cong\Lambda^4V+\Lambda^2(\Lambda^2V)$. Therefore,

$$0=\Big\langle(\tilde\nabla\xi),R^g\Big\rangle=\Big\langle(\tilde\nabla\xi),(\tilde\nabla\xi)+(\xi^2)\Big\rangle=\Big\langle(\tilde\nabla\xi),(\tilde\nabla\xi)\Big\rangle.$$

The last equality holds since the assumption $(V\otimes W\otimes S^2W)^G=\{0\}$ implies $(\tilde\nabla\xi)\in V\otimes W$ and $(\xi^2)\in S^2W$ are orthogonal. ☐

Corollary 6.3. *Let* (M,g,V) *be a* G*-manifold with invariant intrinsic torsion such that* $V^G=\{0\}$ *and such that the intrinsic torsion is skew-symmetric. Then the intrinsic torsion is parallel with respect to the minimal connection.* ☐

The conclusion, that $\tilde\nabla\xi=0$, implies that $H:=\mathrm{Hol}(\tilde\nabla)\subset Stab(\xi)$. However, as $\tilde\nabla$ is a G-connection we also have $H\subset G$. Thus, if $\xi\neq0$ then the holonomy group H must be a proper subgroup of G.

Lemma 6.4. *Let* (M,g,V) *be a* G*-manifold with intrinsic torsion* ξ *and minimal connection* $\tilde\nabla$*. Write* H *for the holonomy group of* $\tilde\nabla$ *and let* (M,g,V') *be the* H*-manifold determined by the holonomy of* $\tilde\nabla$*. Then the intrinsic torsion of* (M,g,V') *is* ξ*.*

Proof. Since $\tilde\nabla$ is a G-connection $H=\mathrm{Hol}(\tilde\nabla)\subset G$. Therefore $\tilde\nabla$ is a H-connection and, moreover, $\mathfrak{g}^\perp\subset\mathfrak{h}^\perp$, whence $\xi\in V'\otimes\mathfrak{h}^\perp$. ☐

Proposition 6.5. *Let* (M,g) *be a Riemannian manifold. Assume there exists a* G*-structure on* M *with tangent representation* V *and skew-symmetric intrinsic torsion taking values in* W*, where* V *and* W *satisfy* $(V\otimes W\otimes S^2W)^G=\{0\}$*. Then there exists an* H*-structure on* M *with invariant skew-symmetric intrinsic torsion which is parallel with respect to the minimal connection.*

Proof. Assume that (M, g, V) is a Riemannian G-manifold with intrinsic torsion $\xi \in W \subset \Lambda^3 V \cap \bigl(V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp\bigr)$. If $(V \otimes W \otimes S^2 W)^G = \{0\}$ then $\tilde\nabla \xi = 0$ by Theorem 6.2. As we have argued above, $H = \mathrm{Hol}(\tilde\nabla)$ then leaves ξ invariant. The Proposition now follows from Lemma 6.4. □

6.2. **Classification.** As corollaries of Lemma 5.13, Theorem 5.14 and Corollary 6.3 we obtain the following classifications.

Theorem 6.6. *Let (M, g, V) be a G-irreducible Riemannian manifold. If the intrinsic torsion of M as a G-manifold is invariant skew-symmetric and non-vanishing then either (M, g) has weak holonomy $SU(3)$ or G_2 or (M, g) is locally isometric to a non-symmetric isotropy irreducible homogeneous space. In particular, (M, g) is Einstein.* □

Recall that a G-manifold (M, g, V) with intrinsic torsion taking values in $W \subset V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp$ for which the three conditions (a), (b) and (c) of Theorem 3.3 are satisfied is G-irreducible and has skew-symmetric intrinsic torsion. For the particular case of $W \cong k\mathbb{R}$ we now have:

Theorem 6.7. *Let (M, g, V) be a Riemannian G-manifold. Assume that the intrinsic torsion takes its values in the G-submodule $W \cong k\mathbb{R} \subset V \otimes \mathfrak{g}^\perp$. Furthermore, assume that V satisfies*

(a′) $(V \otimes S^2_0 V)^G = \{0\}$
(b′) *V is irreducible.*
(c′) *$\mathfrak{g}$ is a proper subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ and $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{u}(n/2)$.*

Then either (M, g) has weak holonomy $SU(3)$ or G_2 or (M, g) is locally isometric to a non-symmetric isotropy irreducible homogeneous space. □

References

[1] W. Ambrose and I. M. Singer, *A theorem on holonomy*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **75** (1953), 428–443.

[2] Th. Bröcker and T. tom Dieck, *Representations of compact Lie groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 98, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.

[3] R. L. Bryant, *Classical, exceptional, and exotic holonomies: a status report*, Actes de la Table Ronde de Géométrie Différentielle (Luminy, 1992) (Paris), Sémin. Congr., vol. 1, Soc. Math. France, 1996, pp. 93–165.

[4] ———, *Recent advances in the theory of holonomy*, Astérisque (2000), no. 266, Exp. No. 861, 5, 351–374, Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 1998/99.

[5] R. Cleyton, *G-structures and Einstein metrics*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, 2001, `ftp://ftp.imada.sdu.dk/pub/phd/2001/24.PS.gz`.

[6] Anna Fino, *Intrinsic torsion and weak holonomy*, Math. J. Toyama Univ. **21** (1998), 1–22.

[7] Th. Friedrich, *On types of non-integrable geometries*, May 2002, eprint `arXiv:math.DG/0205149`.

[8] Th. Friedrich and S. Ivanov, *Parallel spinors and connections with skew-symmetric torsion in string theory*, eprint `arXiv:math.DG/0102142`.

[9] A. Gray, *Weak holonomy groups*, Math. Z. **123** (1971), 290–300.

[10] A. Gray and L. M. Hervella, *The sixteen classes of almost Hermitian manifolds and their linear invariants*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **123** (1980), 35–58.

[11] Jun-ichi Hano and Hideki Ozeki, *On the holonomy groups of linear connections*, Nagoya Math. J. **10** (1956), 97–100.

[12] S. Ivanov, *Connection with torsion, parallel spinors and geometry of Spin*(7) *manifolds*, eprint `arXiv:math.DG/0111216`.

[13] S. Merkulov and L. Schwachhöfer, *Classification of irreducible holonomies of torsion-free affine connections*, Ann. of Math. (2) **150** (1999), no. 1, 77–149.

[14] L. J. Schwachhöfer, *Connections with irreducible holonomy representations*, Adv. Math. **160** (2001), no. 1, 1–80.

[15] F. Tricerri, *Locally homogeneous Riemannian manifolds*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino **50** (1992), no. 4, 411–426 (1993), Differential geometry (Turin, 1992).

(Cleyton) Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark
E-mail address: `cleyton@imada.sdu.dk`

(Swann) Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark
E-mail address: `swann@imada.sdu.dk`